

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/517,209	12/08/2004	Eberhard Ammermann	5000-0108PUS1	4348
2292	7590 08/10/2006		EXAMINER	
BIRCH STEV PO BOX 747	WART KOLASCH & I	QAZI, SABIHA NAIM		
FALLS CHURCH, VA 22040-0747			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1616	
			DATE MAILED: 08/10/2006	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)				
Office Action Summary		10/517,209	AMMERMANN ET AL.				
		Examiner	Art Unit				
		Sabiha Qazi	1616				
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply						
WHIC - Exte after - If NC - Failu Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REP CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING nsions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. O period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory perior are to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by state reply received by the Office later than three months after the mained patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be the will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the cause the application to become ABANDON	ON. imely filed m the mailing date of this communication. IED (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status							
1) 又	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24	May 2006.	•				
-		nis action is non-final.					
3)	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is						
,—	closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
Dispositi	on of Claims						
4)⊠	4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>2-8 and 10-14</u> is/are pending in the application.						
=	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.						
	☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed.						
·	⊠ Claim(s) <u>2-8 and 10-14</u> is/are rejected.						
7)	Claim(s) is/are objected to.						
8)[Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.						
Applicati	on Papers						
9)□	The specification is objected to by the Examir	ner.					
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.							
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).							
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).							
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.							
Priority u	ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of:							
	1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.						
	2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No						
	3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage						
	application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).						
* S	ee the attached detailed Office action for a lis	st of the certified copies not receiv	ed.				
Attachment	• •	_					
	e of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview Summary					
3) 🔲 Inforn	e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/06		Pate Patent Application (PTO-152)				
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 6) Other:							

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-326 (Rev. 7-05) Application/Control Number: 10/517,209 Page 2

Art Unit: 1616

Final Office Action

Claims 2-8 and 10-14 are pending. No claim is allowed at this time. Amendments filed on 5/24/06 have been entered.

Summary of this Office Action dated Saturday, August 5, 2006

- 1. Response to Remarks
- 2. Information Disclosure Statement
- 3. Copending Applications
- 4. Specification
- 5. 35 USC § 103(a) Rejection
- 6. Communication

Response to Remarks

Arguments were not found persusive therefore art rejection is being made. Since amended claims are not to any

Page 3

synergistic combination presently claimed invention is considered obvious. It is prima facie obvious to combine

two compositions each of which is taught by the prior art to be useful for the same purpose in order to form a third

composition that is to be used for the very same purpose; the idea of combining them flows logically from their

having been individually taught in the prior art. In re Kerkhoven, 205 USPQ 1069.

Information Disclosure Statement

The listing of references in the specification is not a proper information disclosure statement. 37

CFR 1.98(b) requires a list of all patents, publications, or other information submitted for consideration by the

Office, and MPEP § 609.04(a) states, "the list may not be incorporated into the specification but must be submitted

in a separate paper." Therefore, unless the references have been cited by the examiner on form PTO-892, they have

not been considered.

Copending Applications

Applicants must bring to the attention of the examiner, or other Office official involved with the

examination of a particular application, information within their knowledge as to other copending United States

applications, which are "material to patentability" of the application in question. MPEP 2001.06(b). See Dayco

Products Inc. v. Total Containment Inc., 66 USPQ2d 1801 (CA FC 2003).

Specification

The specification has not been checked to the extent necessary to determine the presence of all possible

minor errors. Applicant's cooperation is requested in correcting any errors of which applicant may become aware in

the specification.

Art Unit: 1616

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* v. *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

- 1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
- 2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
- 3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
- 4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 2-8 and 10-14 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over GB 857,388, C2002-041978 (abstract, SUMITOMO) and US Patent 6,369,093. GB reference teaches dithia-anthracene compounds and their composition as fungicides. US Patent 6,369,093 teach pyrazolecarboxamide as fungicides, and the abstract of C2002-041978 teaches biphenyl compounds when A represents 5-membered heterocyclic group.

US '093 teaches pyrazole carboxamide as fungicides. See the entire document especially formula (1) in column 1; lines 22-64 in col. 8, lines 6-67 in column 10, examples and claims.

JP reference C2002-041978 teaches biphenyl compounds when A represents 5-membered heterocyclic group.

GB reference teaches dithiaanthracene compounds, see formula claims and I on page 1.

Instant claims differ from the reference in claiming synergistic combination of the two known compounds.

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to prepare additional beneficial compositions by

combining two known compositions. Since prior art teach "A" substituent as 5-membered heterocyclic group

(substituent Z in present claim), one skilled in the art would have been motivated to combine the composition of the

known compounds. It is prima facie obvious to combine two compositions each of which is taught by the prior art

to be useful for the same purpose in order to form a third composition that is to be used for the very same purpose;

the idea of combining them flows logically from their having been individually taught in the prior art. In re

Kerkhoven, 205 USPQ 1069.

In the light of the forgoing discussion, the Examiner's ultimate legal conclusion is that the subject

matter defined by the instant claims would have been obvious within the meaning of 35

U.S.C. 103(a).

Synergistic combination

Since no data has been disclosed for the synergistic combination of dithiaanthracene and pyrazoles or any

5-membered rings the combination of dithiaanthracene and 5-membered heterocylic compounds are considered

obvious for the reasons cited above and are not allowable.

Claims 2 and 3 with dithiaanthracene compound and pyridine (when Z represents Pyridine) are now not allowable

because the synergistic data has been disclosed in the specification but not mention in claims. Note, that claim 1 has

been cancelled.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in

37 CFR 1.136(a).

Application/Control Number: 10/517,209 Page 6

Art Unit: 1616

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however,

Communication

will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sabiha Qazi, Ph.D. whose telephone number is 571-272-0622. The examiner can normally be reached on any business day.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's acting supervisor, Johann Richter, Ph.D. can be reached on 571-272-0646. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

SABIHA QAZI, PH.D PRIMARY EXAMINER

5 Om